

From: Walter Ellinthorpe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/24/02 10:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I, for one, am opposed to the proposed settlement with Microsoft for a variety of reasons. Most of them are very eloquently explained by Dan Kegel at <http://www.kegel.com/remedy/remedy2.html>

I especially agree that something should be done to prevent Microsoft from further limiting the choices available to consumers. When AT&T was broken up, many (Myself included) thought that it was a bad move. Hindsight being 20-20, we now know that this allowed the Telco industry to flourish (even though increased competition forced tighter operations by the Long Distance Telco providers). Now every Telco is eager to implement new technologies in order to beat their competition to it.

Microsoft has a monopoly, therefore they have no competition, therefore they are more interested in making sure they maintain that monopoly than in actually improving their products. For one example, just look at the slew of security holes in their products which have allowed viruses to spread across the Internet costing businesses Billions of dollars. For another example see the "Microsoft Halloween paper" at <http://www.scripting.com/misc/halloweenMemo.html>. Especially look the section titled "Blunting OSS attacks" where the author states....

"Generally, Microsoft wins by attacking the core weaknesses of OSS projects.

De-commoditize protocols & applications

OSS projects have been able to gain a foothold in many server applications because of the wide utility of highly commoditized, simple protocols. By extending these protocols and developing new protocols, we can deny OSS projects entry into the market"

One of the protocols the author recommends that Microsoft "De-Commoditize" is DNS which they have since incorporated into Active Directory. Since they are tying ALL of their server based applications into Active Directory, this would tie all of their applications into using a Microsoft version of DNS.

This paper also states that

* Middleware control is critical. Obviously, as servers and their protocols risk commoditization higher order functionality is necessary to preserve margins in the server OS business.

and...

Long-Term Commitments

Release / Service pack process.

Just look at their new licensing schemes for Windows XP.

This document, which was written in 1998, with 20-20 Hindsight we see that Microsoft not only thought about undermining standard protocols, they have done so. We see that Microsoft has not only thought about using Middleware to exclude competition, they have done so. They not only thought about modifying the Release and Service pack agreements, they have done so.

When will the US Government realize that there IS A PATTERN HERE?????

PLEASE, PLEASE put a stop this. PLEASE come up with a better settlement. One which is more in the interest of the public than the stockholders of Microsoft.

--Walter Ellinthorpe / Field Engineer at United Messaging

--

=====

	Walter Ellinthorpe	United Messaging	Field Engineer	
	Walter.Ellinthorpe@	UnitedMessaging.com	Office 703-488-3967	
	5175 Parkstone Drive Suite 100	Chantilly, VA 22151		